

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 13-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura (JP 2000-193936).

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozawa et al. (US 6,462,724).

Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kurihara et al. (US 5,854,627).

Claims 3-5, 11-13, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. in view of Kurihara et al.

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indication that claims 6-8 contain allowable subject matter.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 14 to further define the invention, and canceled claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, and 15. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16, and 17 are pending for further consideration.

**Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every features of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the features recited by claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, and 15 are alleged not to be shown in the drawings. Accordingly, Applicant has canceled claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, and 15, thereby rendering the objection to the drawings moot.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, claims 3 and 11 allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it most nearly pertains, to make and/or use the invention. Accordingly, Applicant has canceled claims 3 and 11, thereby rendering the rejection of claims 3 and 11 moot.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 13-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura (JP 2000-193936), claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozawa et al. (US 6,462,724), claims 3, 4, 11, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kurihara et al. (US 5,854,627), and claims 3-5, 11-13, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. in view of Kurihara et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recites in independent claims 1, 9, and 14, and hence dependent claims 4-6, 8, 12, 13, 16, and 17.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a gamma reference voltage generating circuit in a liquid crystal display including, at least, “a first gamma power unit receiving a first power from a power converter and outputting a first gamma voltage for a reflective driving mode of the liquid crystal display” and “a second gamma power unit receiving a second power from the power converter and outputting a second gamma voltage for a transmissive driving mode of the liquid crystal display.” In addition, independent claim 1 recites “a switching unit selecting one of the first gamma voltage of the first gamma power unit and the second gamma voltage of the

second gamma power unit, and outputting the selected gamma voltage to a source driving circuit.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, both Kimura and Ozawa et al. fail to teach or suggest first and second gamma power unit receiving first and second powers from a power converter and outputting first and second gamma voltages for reflective and transmissive driving modes of the liquid crystal display. Moreover, Applicant further asserts that Kurihara et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Kimura and/or Ozawa et al.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 102(e), and 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kimura, Ozawa et al., and/or Kurihara et al., whether taken singly or combined, either teaches or suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 9, and 14, and hence dependent claims 4-6, 8, 12, 13, 16, and 17.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 24, 2004

**Customer Number: 009629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-739-3000